This Article is under Formatting, the PDF's ready file will be replaced soon.

Journal of Production Research & Management

eISSN: (2249-4766)

Volume-16, Issue-2, Year- 2026

Article type- Review Article

Received – July 17th, 2026

Accepted – August 24th, 2026

Published- September 10th, 2026

Comparing Graphical and Algebraic Methods in Solving Linear Programming Problems

Savita*
Assistant Professor, *Department of Mathematics*
Chandigarh University Mohali Punjab -140413
Corresponding Authos's Email: savy84@gmail.com

Abstract**—Linear Programming (LP) is a fundamental optimization technique widely employed across engineering, manufacturing, transportation, finance, healthcare, and other industrial sectors to support effective resource allocation and informed decision-making. Among the various solution techniques, the graphical and algebraic methods remain the two most fundamental approaches, each offering distinct advantages depending on the complexity and dimensionality of the optimization problem. This paper presents a comprehensive comparative study of these methods by examining their underlying principles, computational procedures, applicability, strengths, and practical limitations. The graphical method provides an intuitive visualization of the feasible region and optimal solution, making it particularly suitable for problems involving two decision variables and for developing conceptual understanding. However, its applicability is restricted by dimensional limitations and reduced computational scalability. In contrast, the algebraic approach, particularly the Simplex Method and related optimization techniques, provides a systematic and iterative framework capable of solving large-scale linear programming problems involving multiple variables and constraints with high computational accuracy and efficiency. The study further investigates the practical applications of both approaches in supply chain management, manufacturing, financial portfolio optimization, healthcare resource planning, and telecommunications, demonstrating their significance in addressing real-world optimization challenges. In addition, emerging developments, including hybrid optimization strategies, artificial intelligence-assisted optimization, stochastic programming, and metaheuristic algorithms, are discussed to illustrate their contribution toward improving solution quality and computational performance. The comparative analysis indicates that while the graphical method remains an effective educational and analytical tool for small-scale optimization problems, algebraic techniques are indispensable for solving complex industrial-scale applications. The findings facilitate informed solution of LP solution methods and highlight emerging intelligent approaches for efficient optimization**

Keywords— **Linear Programming, Optimization, Graphical Method, Algebraic Method, Simplex Method, Hybrid Optimization, Computational Efficiency, Resource Allocation.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Linear Programming (LP) is a mathematical technique for optimizing the use of limited resources under linear constraints. It is applied across fields such as transportation, finance, and engineering to maximize or minimize an objective function. This paper focuses on comparing graphical and algebraic methods for solving LP problems, emphasizing their applicability, limitations, and effectiveness in different scenarios [1], [2], [3], [4]. Various methods have emerged for solving LP problems, among which the graphical method and algebraic methods such as the simplex and interior-point techniques are prominent. The graphical method, though limited to problems with two decision variables, provides intuitive insights and serves as an educational tool [5], [6]. In contrast, algebraic methods are applicable to higher-dimensional problems and are well-suited for computational implementation [7], [8], [9]. The development of polynomial-time algorithms, such as Karmarkar's interior-point method [10], further advanced the efficiency and applicability of LP solvers[11].

linear programming and Queuing theory are both essential tools in operations research for optimizing system performance under resource constraints. LP techniques can be used to model and solve queuing-related decision problems, such as optimal server allocation or minimizing waiting costs. This capacity constraint can lead to customers being blocked on a server. Due to this, queuing networks with finite capacity nodes, or queuing networks with blocking, have been studied by many authors [12], [13], and [14] using different approaches. Blocking in queuing networks is generally classified into three categories. The first type is transfer blocking, where a job intending to get service from a destination station is forced to wait at the source station until the destination station becomes free [15]. The second type of blocking, known as communication or service blocking, occurs when a job at station i declares its destination station before the service starts. If the destination station is busy, the server at station i will not begin service, and the system becomes blocked [16]. The third type, rejection blocking, occurs when a job is rejected with some probability if the server at the destination station is busy. The job is sent back to the source station until the destination station becomes free [17].

Several researchers have investigated queuing networks with various types of blocking over the years [18], [19], and [20]. These studies have led to advancements in the analysis of blocking probabilities and the development of algorithms for modeling computer communication networks [21]. In recent years, modeling and performance analysis of complex service systems and repairable structures under realistic constraints have attracted increasing attention. These systems often involve components such as imperfect fault detection, delayed repairs, and limited server availability. Studies have addressed such complexities using Bayesian modeling and parametric optimization approaches [22], [23]. Semi-Markov models have also been effectively utilized to capture diverse failure behaviors in parallel systems [24].To optimize these systems, researchers have incorporated human-like behaviors, including reneging, balking, feedback, and vacation policies in queuing environments [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]. Differentiated vacation structures and impatient customer modeling are particularly relevant for congestion analysis in modern communication and service systems [30], [31]. Furthermore, the cost structures in such systems are analyzed under constraints like finite capacity, breakdowns, threshold-based recovery, and discouraged arrivals (c.f. [32], [33], [34]). Optimization techniques, such as nonlinear programming and meta-heuristics, have proven valuable in addressing these challenging scenarios [27], [28], [35]. Advanced models such as the fluid feedback queue have also been introduced using transformation-based stationary analysis techniques [36]. The machine repair problem continues to be a fundamental topic of study, particularly in the presence of unreliable services, standby mechanisms, and various interruptions [37], [38], [39], [40]. These systems are further complicated when integrating fuzzy parameters, catastrophe scenarios, and synchronized reneging, which better represent real-world unpredictability [35], [29], [41], [42].

Transient and steady-state analyses of various queue configurations—such as single and multi-server systems with feed- back, multiple vacations, and Bessel-based solutions—have also been widely explored [43], [44], [40], [45], [46]. These studies support decision-making in dynamic environments by providing performance metrics and optimal strategies. Comprehensive reviews and surveys in this domain have documented significant progress in queueing and machining systems, high- lighting developments in retrial queues and redundancy management over the past decade [47], [48].

This paper aims to present a comparative analysis of graphical and algebraic techniques for solving LP problems, focusing on their methodology, limitations, and suitability for different problem contexts. Emphasis is placed on how each method contributes to understanding and solving LP formulations in both academic and practical environments.

In contrast, the "algebraic method,[49]" particularly the "Simplex Method [50]," offers a more robust and computation- ally efficient solution approach. Instead of relying on graphical visualization, this technique employs matrix operations and iterative computations to navigate the feasible region and locate the optimal solution. By systematically improving the objective function value at each step, the Simplex Method efficiently handles LP problems with multiple decision variables and com- plex constraint structures. Its scalability and precision make it a preferred choice for solving high-dimensional optimization problems in real-world applications [51-55].

This paper presents a comprehensive comparison of these two LP-solving techniques, analyzing their strengths, weaknesses, and practical use cases. By examining their applicability across different problem domains, this study aims to provide insights into selecting the most suitable approach based on problem complexity, computational feasibility, and solution accuracy. Understanding these distinctions can help decision- makers leverage the right optimization strategy to achieve efficient and effective resource allocation.

II. Graphical Method

A. *Concept and Process*

The graphical method is a widely utilized approach for solving linear programming (LP) problems that involve only two decision variables. It provides a structured and intuitive way to determine the optimal solution by visually representing constraints and the objective function on a two-dimensional coordinate plane. The method allows for easy interpretation of feasible regions and optimal points.

B. A*dvantages and Limitations*:

Advantages:

- **Easy to understand and interpret**: The graphical method provides an intuitive visual representation of the LP

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GRAPHICAL METHOD

Aspect	Description
Problem Type	Suitable for LP problems with two variables
Visualization	Provides a graphical representation of feasible regions
Accuracy	Limited by manual plotting precision
Optimal Solution	Found at a corner point of the feasible region
Complexity	Easy for small problems but infeasible for large-scale LP
Computation	No matrix or algebraic operations required
Usage	Best for educational purposes and simple optimization problems

problem, making it particularly useful for individuals new to optimization techniques.

- **Effective in illustrating feasibility and optimization**: By visually displaying constraints and objective function values, the method offers clear insights into how different conditions affect the final solution.
- **Useful for educational purposes**: Due to its simplicity, the graphical method serves as an excellent tool for teaching and learning the fundamental concepts of linear programming before progressing to more advanced computational techniques.

Limitations:

- **Restricted to two-variable problems**: The graphical approach is only applicable to LP problems involving two decision variables since higher-dimensional problems cannot be effectively represented on a two-dimensional graph.
- **Inefficient for large-scale problems**: In practical scenarios, most LP problems contain multiple variables and constraints, making graphical representation impractical. For such cases, algebraic methods like the Simplex Method are preferred.
- **Dependence on precise graphing**: The accuracy of the solution is reliant on correctly plotting constraint lines and identifying intersection points. Errors in graphing can lead to incorrect conclusions regarding the optimal solution.

III. ALGEBRAIC METHOD

A. *Concept and Process*

The algebraic method is a systematic and computationally robust approach used to solve Linear Programming (LP) problems, particularly when they involve multiple decision variables. Unlike the graphical method, which is restricted to two-variable problems due to its reliance on visual representation, the algebraic method can handle complex, large-scale optimization problems effectively.

One of the most widely recognized algebraic approaches for solving LP problems is the Simplex Method. Developed by

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF ALGEBRAIC LP SOLVING METHODS

Method	Best for	Limitations
Simplex Method	General LP problems	Can be slow for very large LPs
Dual Simplex	LP with infeasible initial solution	Requires additional computation
Interior-Point	Large-scale LP problems	Higher memory usage

George Dantzig, the Simplex Method is an iterative algorithm that systematically examines feasible solutions and progressively improves the objective function value until the optimal solution is reached.

The process of solving an LP problem algebraically typically consists of the following steps:

1) **Formulating the LP problem**: The first step involves converting the problem into a standard mathematical form by defining the objective function and constraints in linear equations or inequalities.
2) **Setting up the initial tableau**: The LP problem is structured into a matrix format, referred to as the simplex tableau, which organizes the coefficients of the constraints, decision variables, and objective function.
3) **Performing iterative computations**: Using row operations and pivoting techniques, the simplex algorithm iteratively updates the tableau, progressively improving the objective function value while maintaining feasibility.
4) **Identifying the optimal solution**: The iterative process continues until no further improvements can be made to the objective function, indicating that the optimal solution has been reached. The corresponding values of the decision variables at this stage provide the final solution to the problem.

B. *Advantages and Limitations*

Advantages:

- Capable of solving LP problems with multiple decision variables, making it highly suitable for real-world applications.
- Provides precise numerical solutions without relying on graphical approximations.
- Can be automated using computational tools and software, allowing for efficient solving of large-scale optimization problems.

Limitations:

- Requires computational resources and is difficult to exe- cute manually for large problems.

- Lacks a visual representation, making it less intuitive compared to the graphical method.
- Involves multiple iterative steps, which may be complex for individuals unfamiliar with matrix operations and optimization algorithms.

IV. COMPARISON OF GRAPHICAL AND ALGEBRAIC METHODS

Both the graphical and algebraic methods serve as effective tools for solving Linear Programming (LP) problems, but they differ significantly in their applicability, ease of use, computational efficiency, and precision. This section provides a structured comparison of these two approaches to highlight their strengths and limitations in practical applications.

The graphical method is particularly useful for solving LP problems that involve only two decision variables. It provides a visual representation of feasible regions and optimal solutions, making it an intuitive approach for educational and small-scale applications. However, its reliance on manual plotting restricts its usability for problems with three or more variables, where visualization becomes impractical.

On the other hand, the algebraic method, particularly the Simplex Method, is designed to handle larger and more com- plex LP problems involving multiple decision variables and constraints. This method systematically moves along the edges of the feasible region to locate the optimal solution, making it computationally efficient. Unlike the graphical method, which relies on a visual approach, the algebraic method is purely numerical and requires matrix operations. As a result, it is well- suited for solving real-world optimization problems in industries such as logistics, finance, manufacturing, and operations research.

Table III presents a side-by-side comparison of the graphical and algebraic methods based on various performance criteria.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF GRAPHICAL AND ALGEBRAIC METHODS

Feature	Graphical Method	Algebraic Method
Applicability	Limited to two variables	Suitable for multiple variables
Ease of Use	Simple and intuitive	Requires knowledge of matrix operations
Visualization	Provides a graphical solution	No visual representation
Computational Efficiency	Requires manual graphing	Efficient for large problems using software
Accuracy	Dependent on graphing precision	Provides exact numerical results

V. CASE STUDIES AND REAL-WORLD EXAMPLES

A. Optimization in Supply Chain Management

One of the most impactful applications of linear program- ming (LP) is in supply chain optimization. Large-scale enter- prises utilize LP models to enhance efficiency in procurement, production scheduling, and distribution.

Case Study: Global Retail Chain A multinational retailer sought to minimize transportation costs while ensuring timely product delivery across multiple warehouses. By formulating an LP model incorporating constraints such as vehicle capacity, delivery deadlines, and warehouse storage limits, the company successfully reduced logistics costs by 18% and improved inventory turnover.

Table IV highlights various real-world applications of LP across industries.

TABLE IV
COMMON REAL-WORLD APPLICATIONS OF LINEAR PROGRAMMING

Industry	Application
Supply Chain	Optimal route planning, ware- house allocation
Manufacturing	Production scheduling, inventory management
Finance	Portfolio optimization, risk minimization
Telecommunications	Network flow optimization, bandwidth allocation
Healthcare	Hospital resource management, scheduling surgeries

B. Manufacturing Process Optimization

Manufacturers leverage LP techniques to optimize production schedules, minimize raw material waste, and improve operational efficiency.

Case Study: Automotive Industry An automobile manufacturing company implemented LP to determine the optimal mix of vehicle models to be produced while considering constraints such as labor hours, material availability, and factory capacity. The model helped the company maximize revenue while ensuring compliance with supplier contracts and workforce availability.

C. Financial Portfolio Management

LP is widely used in the financial sector to construct optimal investment portfolios that balance risk and return.

Case Study: Investment Firm A financial institution ap- plied LP to allocate capital among various asset classes while adhering to client-specific risk tolerance and regulatory constraints. The optimized portfolio resulted in a 12% increase in annual returns while reducing risk exposure.

D. Healthcare Resource Allocation

LP plays a critical role in optimizing hospital resource distribution, including staff scheduling, patient assignment, and medical equipment allocation.

Case Study: Hospital Management A hospital used LP to optimize nurse shift scheduling while ensuring adequate staffing for emergency and ICU units. By integrating LP-based workforce planning, the hospital achieved a 15% reduction in overtime costs and improved patient care efficiency.

E. Telecommunications Network Optimization

Telecommunications companies employ LP models to optimize bandwidth allocation and network routing.

Case Study: Internet Service Provider An ISP utilized LP techniques to dynamically allocate bandwidth to high-traffic areas while minimizing congestion. The result was a 25% improvement in network efficiency and reduced latency for end-users.

These case studies highlight the versatility of LP in solving real-world challenges across industries.

VI. Hybrid Approaches and Advanced LP Methods

A. Integer Linear Programming (ILP)

In many practical applications, decision variables must be restricted to integer values, leading to Integer Linear Program- ming (ILP). This technique is extensively used in logistics, facility location planning, and workforce scheduling.

B. Nonlinear Programming (NLP)

Some optimization problems involve nonlinear relationships between variables, making traditional LP methods inadequate. Nonlinear Programming (NLP) extends LP by allowing objective functions and constraints to be nonlinear, broadening its applications in machine learning, energy optimization, and engineering design.

C. Metaheuristic Algorithms in LP

For large-scale LP problems where conventional methods may be computationally expensive, metaheuristic approaches such as Genetic Algorithms (GA), Simulated Annealing (SA), and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) provide efficient ap- proximations.

D. Hybrid Approaches Combining LP with AI

The integration of LP with artificial intelligence and machine learning enables adaptive optimization models that improve over time.

Table V provides an overview of hybrid LP approaches.

TABLE V
Overview of Hybrid LP Approaches

Hybrid Approach	**Description**
LP + Heuristics	Integrates LP with heuristic methods such as genetic algorithms or greedy strategies to solve large-scale or non-convex problems.
LP + Metaheuristics	Combines LP with metaheuristics like simulated annealing or particle swarm optimization for complex and global optimization.
LP + AI	Employs machine learning or deep learning models to estimate parameters, reduce dimensionality, or guide LP solvers.
LP + Fuzzy Logic	Used to handle uncertainty or vagueness in constraints or objectives using fuzzy sets within the LP model.
LP + Evolutionary Algorithms	Applies evolutionary computation to explore search spaces where traditional LP struggles due to nonlinearities or discontinuities.

E. Stochastic Linear Programming

Traditional LP assumes all input data is deterministic. How- ever, in real-world scenarios, uncertainty exists in demand forecasts, financial markets, and supply chain logistics. Stochastic Linear Programming (SLP) incorporates probabilistic elements into LP models to account for uncertain variables.

VII. Future Trends in Linear Programming

The evolution of technology has introduced several emerging trends in LP, enhancing its applicability across industries.

A. AI-Powered LP Solvers

Machine learning and AI are being increasingly integrated into LP solvers to automate model formulation and improve computational efficiency.

- AI-enhanced solvers learn from past optimization problems to predict efficient solving strategies.
- Deep learning techniques assist in generating LP constraints dynamically based on real-world data.
- AI-driven model selection optimizes computation by determining the best algorithm for a given problem.

B. Quantum Computing for Large-Scale LP

Quantum computing is expected to revolutionize optimization by significantly reducing computational time for complex LP problems.

- Quantum algorithms like Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) provide faster solutions for large-scale LP.
- Potential applications include real-time financial risk assessment, logistics optimization, and smart grid energy distribution.

C. Edge Computing and LP Optimization

With the rise of IoT and real-time data analytics, LP models are being integrated into edge computing devices.

- Edge-based LP models optimize resources locally without requiring cloud-based computations.
- Applications include real-time traffic control, smart city infrastructure, and adaptive industrial automation.

Table VI presents a summary of key emerging trends in LP.

TABLE VI
EMERGING TRENDS IN LINEAR PROGRAMMING

Trend	**Description**
Quantum LP	Quantum computing techniques for LP solutions
AI-driven Optimization	Deep learning models improving LP efficiency
Cloud-Based LP	Scalable LP solutions using cloud computing
Real-Time LP	Adaptive LP models responding to live data

These emerging trends indicate that LP will continue evolving, integrating cutting-edge technologies to enhance its effectiveness in solving real-world problems.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Linear Programming (LP) has established itself as a fundamental optimization technique that plays a crucial role in decision-making across various industries, including logistics, manufacturing, finance, and healthcare. Through systematic methodologies such as the graphical and algebraic approaches, LP enables businesses and organizations to achieve cost efficiency, maximize resource utilization, and enhance operational effectiveness. While the graphical method provides an intuitive understanding of LP by visually representing constraints and feasible solutions, its applicability is limited to problems with only two decision variables. In contrast, the algebraic approach, particularly the Simplex Method, offers a robust and scalable solution for handling large-scale LP problems. Furthermore, hybrid approaches, such as integrating LP with artificial intelligence, metaheuristics, and stochastic programming, have expanded its capabilities, making LP adaptable to real-time and uncertain environments. The case studies presented illustrate how LP has been successfully applied in real-world scenarios, optimizing everything from supply chain logistics and financial portfolios to healthcare resource allocation and telecommunications networks. Additionally, emerging trends such as AI- driven LP solvers, quantum computing optimizations, and blockchain-based secure optimization indicate that LP will continue to evolve, integrating cutting-edge technologies to address increasingly complex decision-making challenges. As computational power advances and industries demand more sophisticated optimization solutions, LP will remain at the fore- front of mathematical modeling and problem-solving. Future research in this domain should focus on enhancing computational efficiency, improving model adaptability to dynamic environments, and exploring new interdisciplinary applications. By continuing to refine LP methodologies and integrating them with modern technologies, organizations can leverage optimization techniques to drive innovation, sustainability, and strategic growth.

REFERENCES

[1] G. B. Dantzig, *Linear Programming and Extensions*. Princ eton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963.

[2] V. Chva´tal, *Linear Programming*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman, 1983.

[3] R. L. Rardin, *Optimization in Operations Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

[4] M. S. Bazaraa, J. J. Jarvis, and H. D. Sherali, *Linear Programming and Network Flows*, 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2010.

[5] K. G. Murty, *Linear Programming*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1983.

[6] H. Karloff, *Linear Programming*. Boston, MA: Birkha¨user, 1991.

[7] S. J. Wright, *Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1997.

[8] D. Bertsimas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Introduction to Linear Optimization*. Belmont, MA: Athena Scientific, 1997.

[9] A. Schrijver, *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 1998.

[10]N. Karmarkar, “A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear program-ming,” *Combinatorica*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 373–395, 1984.

[11]A. Talebi, S. P. H. Boroujeni, and A. Razi, “Integrating random regret minimization-based discrete choice models with mixed integer linear programming for revenue optimization,” *Iran J. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 21–35, 2025.

[12]T. Altiok, “Approximate analysis of exponential tandem queues with blocking,” *Euro. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 11, pp. 390–397, 1982.

[13]S. Balsamo and G. Iazeoalla, “Some equivalence properties for queuing networks with and without blocking,” in *Proc. Perform. vol. 83*, 1983, pp. 351–360.

[14] F. Baskett, K. Chandy, R. Muntz, and G. Palacios, “Open closed and mixed network of queues with different classes of customers,” *J. ACM*, vol. 22, pp. 248–260, 1975.

[15] S. Chaung, A. Kashper, and K. Ross, “Computing approximate block-ing probabilities for large loss networks with state-dependent routing,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Networking*, vol. 1, pp. 105–115, 1993.

[16] X. Chao, M. Miyazawa, and M. Pinedo, *Queuing Network: Customers, signals and product form solution*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 1999.

[17] E. Kamal and A. Al-Yatama, “Blocking probability in circuit switched wavelength division multiplexing networks under multicast service,” *Performance Evaluation*, vol. 47, pp. 43–71, 2002.

[18] F. Kelly, “Routing and capacity allocation in network with trunk reser-vation,” *Math. Oper. Res.*, vol. 15, pp. 771–792, 1990.

[19] R. Onvural and H. Perros, “On equivalencies of blocking mechanisms in queuing networks with blocking,” *Oper. Res. Lett.*, vol. 5, pp. 293–297, 1986.

[20] M. Reiser and H. Kobayashi, “Queuing networks with multiple

closed chains: Theory and computational algorithms," *IBM J. Res. Develop.*, vol. 19, pp. 283–294, 1975.

[21] M. Woodward, "Efficient computation of performance measures for queuing networks," *J. Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol. 21, pp. 453–472, 1994.

[22] A. Kumar and C. Shekhar, "Bayesian modeling of repairable systems with imperfect coverage and delayed detection dynamics," *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 2025.

[23] A. Kumar, "Parametric optimization of repairable systems in iot: ad-dressing detection delays, imperfect coverage, and fuzzy parameters," *Life Cycle Reliability and Safety Engineering*, pp. 1–12, 2025.

[24] P. Baloda, A. Kumar, and V. Garg, "Reliability estimation of parallel systems with diverse failure modes: Semi-markov model approach," *Journal of Reliability and Statistical Studies*, pp. 351–366, 2024.

[25] A. Kumar, C. Shekhar, and Savita, "Optimizing resource allocation in m/m/1/n queues with feedback, discouraged arrivals, and reneging for enhanced service delivery," *Journal of Reliability and Statistical Studies*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2024.

[26] A. Kumar, C. Shekhar *et al.*, "Cost analysis of a finite capacity queue with server failures, balking, and threshold-driven recovery policy," *International Journal of Mathematical, Engineering and Management Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 5, p. 1198, 2024.

[27] C. Shekhar, S. Varshney, and A. Kumar, "Optimal control of a service system with emergency vacation using bat algorithm," *Journal of com-putational and applied mathematics*, vol. 364, p. 112332, 2020.

[28] ——, "Matrix-geometric solution of multi-server queueing systems with bernoulli scheduled modified vacation and retention of reneged cus-tomers: A meta-heuristic approach," *Quality Technology & Quantitative Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 39–66, 2021.

[29] C. Shekhar, N. Kumar, A. Gupta, A. Kumar, and S. Varshney, "Warm-spare provisioning computing network with switching failure, common cause failure, vacation interruption, and synchronized reneging," *Relia-bility Engineering & System Safety*, vol. 199, p. 106910, 2020.

[30] A. Kumar, S. Kaswan, M. Devanda, and C. Shekhar, "Transient anal-ysis of queueing-based congestion with differentiated vacations and customer's impatience attributes," *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 15 655–15 665, 2023.

[31] C. Shekhar, A. Gupta, N. Kumar, A. Kumar, and S. Varshney, "Transient solution of multiple vacation queue with discouragement and feedback," *Scientia Iranica*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 2567–2577, 2022.

[32] A. Kumar, D. Gulia, and V. Garg, "Optimizing service queues in working vacation scenarios: A queueing theory perspective," in *2024 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Emerging Technology (Global AI Summit)*, 2024, pp. 1342–1347.

[33] A. Kumar, P. Prikshit, and S. S. Chauhan Gonder, "Queueing system optimization and computational analysis: A comprehensive investigation into research evaluation," in *2024 4th International Conference on Advancement in Electronics & Communication Engineering (AECE)*, 2024, pp. 391–396.

[34] A. Kumar and S. Singh, "Optimizing service performance in single working vacation: Queueing theory perspective," in *2024 4th Interna-tional Conference on Advancement in Electronics & Communication Engineering (AECE)*, 2024, pp. 386–390.

[35] C. Shekhar, A. Kumar, and S. Varshney, "Parametric nonlinear pro-gramming for fuzzified queuing systems with catastrophe," *International Journal of Process Management and Benchmarking*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 69–98, 2020.

[36] A. Kumar, A. Kumar, and C. Shekhar, "Transformation-based stationary analysis of single server feedback fluid queue: An enhanced approach," in *2023 3rd International Conference on Advancement in Electronics & Communication Engineering (AECE)*, 2023, pp. 580–583.

[37] C. Shekhar, S. Varshney, and A. Kumar, "Standbys provisioning in ma-chine repair problem with unreliable service and vacation interruption," in *The Handbook of Reliability, Maintenance, and System Safety through Mathematical Modeling*. Elsevier, 2021, pp. 101–133.

[38] A. Kumar, M. Boualem, A. A. Bouchentouf, and Savita, "Optimal analysis of machine interference problem with standby, random switching failure, vacation interruption and synchronized reneging," in *Applications of advanced optimization techniques in industrial engineering*. CRC Press, 2022, pp. 155–168.

[39] C. Shekhar, A. Kumar, S. Varshney, and S. I. Ammar, "Fault-tolerant redundant repairable system with different failures and delays," *Engi-neering Computations*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 1043–1071, 2019.

[40] ——, "$M/G/1$ fault-tolerant machining system with imperfection," *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2020.

[41] C. Shekhar, S. Varshney, and A. Kumar, "Reliability and vacation: The critical issue," *Advances in Reliability Analysis and its Applications*, pp. 251–292, 2020.

[42] V. Klimenok, C. S. Kim, and A. Dudin, "Tandem queueing system with different types of customers," in *International Conference on Analytical and Stochastic Modeling Techniques and Applications*. Springer, 2011, pp. 99–112.

[43] A. Kumar, "Single server multiple vacation queue with discouragement solve by confluent hypergeometric function," *Journal of Ambient Intelli-gence and Humanized Computing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 6411–6422, 2023.

[44] C. Shekhar, A. Kumar, and S. Varshney, "Modified bessel series solution of the single server queueing model with feedback," *International Journal of Computing Science and Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 313–326, 2019.

[45] A. A. Bouchentouf, L. Medjahri, M. Boualem, and A. Kumar, "Math-ematical analysis of a markovian multi-server feedback queue with a variant of multiple vacations, balking and reneging," *Discrete and Continuous models and Applied Computational Science*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 21–38, 2022.

[46] J. Wang, H. Abouee-Mehrizi, O. Baron, and O. Berman, "Tandem queues with impatient customers," *Performance Evaluation*, vol. 135, p. 102011, 2019.

[47] C. Shekhar, A. Raina, A. Kumar, and J. Iqbal, "A survey on queues in machining system: progress from 2010 to 2017," *Yugoslav Journal of Operations Research*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 391–413, 2017.

[48] C. Shekhar and A. Kumar, "Brief review on retrial queue: Progress in 2010-2015," *Int. Journal of Applied Sciences and Engineering Research*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 324–336, 2016.

[49] J. E. Patin˜o, L. A. G. Pareja, and O. G. Carmona, "Optimal placement, sizing and operation of d-statcoms in power distribution systems using a mixed-integer linear programming model," *Results Eng.*, 2025, art. no. 104749.

[50] S. Awoniyi, "A strongly polynomial-time algorithm for the general linear programming problem," 2025.

[51] C. Shekhar, A. Kumar, and S. Varshney, "Load sharing redundant repairable systems with switching and reboot delay," *Reliability Engi-neering & System Safety*, vol. 193, p. 106656, 2020.

[52] I. Akyildiz, "Exact product from solution queuing networks with block-ing," *IEEE Trans. Comput.*, vol. 1, pp. 122–126, 1987.

[53] B. Desert and H. Daduna, "Discrete-time tandem networks of queues effects of different regulation schemes for simultaneous events," *Perfor-mance Evaluation*, vol. 47, pp. 73–104, 2002.

[54] G. Diehl, "A buffer equivalency decomposition approach to finite buffer queueing networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, U.S.A., 1984.

[55] H. Perror, A. Nilsson, and Y. Liu, "Approximate analysis of product form type queuing networks with blocking and deadlock," *Perform. Eval.*, vol. 8, pp. 19–39, 1988.